

1
2
3
4
5 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
6 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
7

8 WILLIAM MISIEWICZ,

9 *Plaintiff,*

10 vs.

11 STATE OF NEVADA, *et al.*

12 *Defendants.*
13

2:13-cv-01419-MMD-VCF

ORDER

14
15 IT IS ORDERED that defendants' motion (#32) to screen the amended complaint and
16 motion (#33) to extend their time to answer both are DENIED as unnecessary. The Court
17 does not need, or want, prompting by motion to screen matters that it screens as a matter of
18 course. Nor do defendants need an extension of time to answer in this type of case prior to
19 an express directive that they do so. Counsel might consider in future instead filing a motion
20 to withdraw an answer as improvidently filed in the circumstance presented by their
21 inadvertent answer on May 14, 2014. The Court will disregard the answer and will screen the
22 amended complaint as promptly as its docket allows.

23 DATED: June 3, 2014

24
25 

26 CAM FERENBACH
27 United States Magistrate Judge
28